



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)  
DWW May-05

Paper No. 18

GREGORY M. SMITH  
QUARLES & BRADY  
500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3700  
CHICAGO IL 60661-2511

**COPY MAILED****MAY 24 2005****OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Patent No. 6,173,267 :  
Issued: 9 January, 2000 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Application No. 09/028,718 :  
Filed: 24 February, 1998 :  
Atty Docket No. P97.2784 :

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(c),<sup>1</sup> filed on 19 April, 2005 (certificate of transmission date 11 January, 2005), to accept the unintentionally delayed payment of a maintenance fee for the above-identified patent.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The patent issued on 9 January, 2001. The window for payment of the third maintenance fee installment with a surcharge closed on 10 January, 2005. Therefore, since this petition was filed within twenty-four (24) months of the six-month grace period provided in 37 CFR 1.362(e), this petition was timely filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.378(c).

Accordingly, the maintenance fee in this case is hereby accepted and the above-identified patent is hereby reinstated as of the mail date of this decision.

The statement of unintentional delay was not signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the delay in

<sup>1</sup>37 CFR 1.378(c) provides that a petition to accept an unintentionally delayed payment of a maintenance fee must be filed within twenty-four months of the six-month grace period provided in § 1.362(e) and must include:

- (1) The required maintenance fee set forth in § 1.20(e) through (g);
- (2) The surcharge set forth in § 1.20(I)(2); and
- (3) A statement that the delay in payment of the maintenance fee was unintentional.

paying the maintenance fee was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was in fact unintentional, petitioner should make a reasonable inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must so notify the Office. If petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding any Maintenance Fee Reminder which may be mailed concerning this patent, a Fee Address should be submitted to Maintenance Fee Division.

The address listed on the petition is different than the correspondence address of record. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address noted on the petition. However, until otherwise instructed, all future correspondence regarding this patent will be mailed solely to the address of record.

The file is being forwarded to Files Repository.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions

cc: Robert P. Greenspoon  
Niro, Scavone, Haller & Niro  
181 W. Madison Street, Suite 4600  
Chicago IL 60602